of which form a second run-on ramp configured to lift the outer link plate in a radial direction. For these reasons, this rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-9, 12, 15 and 16 were rejected as claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Since claims 2-3, 5, 7-9, 12, 15 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all the limitations of the claim 1, they are felt to overcome the 102 rejection in the same manner as claim 1.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yahata (2002/0086753). Yahata discloses a chamfered portion 48, smoothly contoured to resist trapping mud (FIG. 6). Accordingly, chamfered portion 48 fails to allow the outer link plate to be positioned laterally at the first tooth and fails to lift the outer link plate in a radial direction when the outer link plate is positioned laterally at the first tooth, as claimed in the present invention. For this reason, this rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16 and 24 were rejected as claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Since claims 2-3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16 and 24 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all the limitations of the claim 1, they are felt to overcome the 102 rejection in the same manner as claim 1.

This reply is believed to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the Examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MARKUS REITER

Lisa Serdynski, Attorney Registration No. 40,307

SRAM, LLC

1333 N. Kingsbury, 4th Floor

Chicago, IL 60642